APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/072,693	02/06/2002	Petr Hrebejk	SUN-P6327	2517

24209	7590	12/29/2005

GUNNISON MCKAY & HODGSON, LLP
1900 GARDEN ROAD
SUITE 220
MONTEREY, CA 93940

EXAMINER
HO, ANDY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2194	

DATE MAILED: 12/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/072,693	HREBEJK ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Andy Ho	2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 October 2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,8-13,15-19,24,26-31,33-38 and 40-42* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,8-13,15-19,24,26-31,33-38 and 40-42* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed 10/3/2005.

2. Claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-19, 24, 26-31, 33-38 and 40-42 have been examined and are pending in the application.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 27 is objected to because of the following informalities: the applicant recites "The apparatus of claim 25" on line 1, which is an inappropriate dependent because claim 25 had been cancelled. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-19, 24, 26-31, 33-38 and 40-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hinson U.S Patent No. 6,829,770 in view of LeBlanc U.S Patent No. 6,694,506.

As to claim 1, Hinson teaches a method for notifying one or more listeners of an event (provides an event class object to distribute information produced by a publisher to one or more subscribers, lines 41-43 column 11) in a object facility repository (142,

Fig. 7), the event having an event type (to subscribe to a particular outgoing-event

interface method..., lines 40-53 column 13; the type of object to be retrieved from the

event objects store 140, lines 60-61 column 16), the method including:

creating an event object for the event (event object 102, Fig. 5; event objects

within the storage 142, Fig. 7), the event object corresponding to the event sub-type

(class of the event objects having methods, lines 8-41 column 12);

performing the event (firing an event, line 50 column 11);

calling a method for each of the listeners (calling a method on interface 110, lines

50-54 column 11) registered for event notification for the event type (registration for

events by the subscribers, lines 40-53 column 13) by passing said event object to

listeners (sending the events to the subscribers, line 39 column 11 to line 22 column 12)

described in an event source interface corresponding to the event type (COM+ Events

system interfaces, lines 35-42 column 16), said method for each of the listeners

implemented by each listener (...the subscribers 106-108 are COM Objects that have a

subscription to a method or methods of the outgoing-event interface 110, which causes

the event class object 102 to propagate events fired on the methods to the subscribers.

The subscribers 106-108 individually expose outgoing-event interfaces 116 that are

defined identically to the event class object's outgoing-event interface 110. The event

class object 102 propagates the event by calling the method of the subscribers'

outgoing-event interfaces that correspond to the method called by the publisher in the

event class object's interface 110. The implementation of the outgoing-event interface

methods in the subscriber 106-108 includes the subscriber code that processes or acts

on the event..., lines 49-61 column 12).

Hinson does not explicitly teach the object facility repository is a meta object

facility repository. However, Hinson teaches (lines 50-57 column 7) that the invention

can be implemented in combination with other program modules that implement

particular abstract data types. Therefore one of ordinary skill in the art would conclude

that the particular abstract data type could be metadata defining the structure of data

objects and the object facility repository of Hinson could be a meta object facility

repository.

Hinson further does not teach vetoable event notification. LeBlanc teaches (Fig.

4, line 39 column 7 to line 12 column 9) a system of event notification having an event

producer and multiple event listeners wherein before an event is occurred; a vetoable

condition is being tested. If the vetoable condition is satisfied, the event is not going to

occur. If the vetoable condition is not satisfied, the event occurred. It would have been

obvious to apply the teachings of LeBlanc to the system of Hinson because by using

vetoable condition, the system could make appropriate changes as disclosed by

LeBlanc (line 59 column 8 to line 12 column 9).

As to claim 2, Hinson as modified further teaches a listener registers for event

notification by passing a registration call to a class implemented by the MOF designed

to track listener registrations in said event source interface corresponding to the event

type (...the COM+ Events system 140 includes services in the form of application

programming interface functions that can be called to register, remove or modify

subscriptions, as well as to retrieve or enumerate subscriptions to a particular outgoing-event interface method; the subscriber objects 106-108 implement the code that calls the COM+ Events API function for registering a subscription so as to subscribe to a particular outgoing-event interface method..., lines 40-53 column 13).

As to claim 3, Hinson as modified further teaches class implemented by the MOF corresponds only to the event type (to subscribe to a particular outgoing-event interface method..., lines 40-53 column 13).

As to claim 4, Hinson as modified further teaches class implemented by the MOF maintains a record of which listener is registered for notification of which events (stores persistent subscriptions, lines 34-39 column 13).

As to claim 5, Hinson as modified further teaches the event type is a class, instance, or association (class of the event objects having methods, lines 8-41 column 12; to subscribe to a particular outgoing-event interface method..., lines 40-53 column 13).

As to claim 6, Hinson as modified further teaches calling a method for each of the listeners (calling a method on interface 110, lines 50-54 column 11) registered for event notification for the event sub-type (...the subscriptions specify which subscribers to call whenever a call is made to the subscribed event class method. The subscribers also expose an interface matching the event class interface that contains the subscribed method..., lines 25-30 column 4; class of the event objects having methods, lines 8-41 column 12; registration for events by the subscribers, lines 40-53 column 13) by passing the event object to event sub-type listeners (sending the events to the subscribers, line

39 column 11 to line 22 column 12) as indicated by a bitmask in a combination event

source interface (...subscription 120 is an object that contains an event class identifier

122 and an event method identifier 124 to specify the events, and a subscriber

reference 126 to specify the subscriber 106..., line 67 column 12 to line 3 column 13),

the method for each of the listeners registered for event notification implemented by

each listener (...the subscribers 106-108 are COM Objects that have a subscription to a

method or methods of the outgoing-event interface 110, which causes the event class

object 102 to propagate events fired on the methods to the subscribers. The subscribers

106-108 individually expose outgoing-event interfaces 116 that are defined identically to

the event class object's outgoing-event interface 110. The event class object 102

propagates the event by calling the method of the subscribers' outgoing-event interfaces

that correspond to the method called by the publisher in the event class object's

interface 110. The implementation of the outgoing-event interface methods in the

subscriber 106-108 includes the subscriber code that processes or acts on the event...,

lines 49-61 column 12), wherein a listener registers for event notification for an event

type by setting a bit corresponding to the event sub-type in a combination event source

interface (contains an event class identifier 122 and an event method identifier 124 to

specify the events, line 67 column 12 to line 3 column 13).

As to claim 8, it is a method claim of claims 2 and 7. Therefore, it is rejected for

the same reasons as claims 2 and 7 above.

As to claims 9-11, they are method claims of claims 3-4 and 6, respectively.

Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 3-4 and 6 above.

As to claim 12, it is a method claim of claims 1 and 6. Therefore, it is rejected

for the same reasons as claims 1 and 6 above. Hinson further teach event types

including an instance event (line 58 column 1 to line 10 column 2), a class event (line

18-30 column 4), an associate event and a combination of events (line 58 column 1 to

line 10 column 2). LeBlanc further teaches performing the vent comprises making a

change (94 and 95, Fig. 4). Note the discussion of claim 1 above for the reason of

combining references.

As to claim 13, Hinson teaches a method for registering for event notification of

an event (registration for events by the subscribers, lines 40-53 column 13) in an object

facility repository (142, Fig. 7), the event having an event type (to subscribe to a

particular outgoing-event interface method..., lines 40-53 column 13; the type of object

to be retrieved from the event objects store 140, lines 60-61 column 16), the method

including:

implementing a method for event notification corresponding to the event type

(method on interface 110, lines 50-54 column 11);

passing a registration call to a class implemented by the MOF designed to track

listener registrations in an event source interface corresponding to the event type (...the

COM+ Events system 140 includes services in the form of application programming

interface functions that can be called to register, remove or modify subscriptions, as well

as to retrieve or enumerate subscriptions to a particular outgoing-event interface

method; the subscriber objects 106-108 implement the code that calls the COM+ Events

API function for registering a subscription so as to subscribe to a particular outgoing-

event interface method..., lines 40-53 column 13); event types including an instance

event (line 58 column 1 to line 10 column 2), a class event (line 18-30 column 4), an

associate event and a combination of events (line 58 column 1 to line 10 column 2).

Hinson does not explicitly teach the object facility repository is a meta object

facility repository. However, Hinson teaches (lines 50-57 column 7) that the invention

can be implemented in combination with other program modules that implement

particular abstract data types. Therefore one of ordinary skill in the art would conclude

that the particular abstract data type could be metadata defining the structure of data

objects and the object facility repository of Hinson could be a meta object facility

repository.

As to claim 15, Hinson teaches an apparatus for notifying one or more listeners

of an event (provides an event class object to distribute information produced by a

publisher to one or more subscribers, lines 41-43 column 11) in an object facility

repository (142, Fig. 7), the event having an event type (to subscribe to a particular

outgoing-event interface method..., lines 40-53 column 13; the type of object to be

retrieved from the event objects store 140, lines 60-61 column 16) and sub-type (class

of the event objects having methods, lines 8-41 column 12), the apparatus including:

an event source interface corresponding to the event type (COM+ Events system

interfaces, lines 35-42 column 16); and

a memory storing an event object (event objects within storage 142, Fig. 7), said

event object corresponding to the event sub-type (class of the event objects having

methods, lines 8-41 column 12), said memory coupled to said event source interface
(connection of 140 and 142, Fig. 7).

Hinson does not explicitly teach the object facility repository is a meta object
facility repository. However, Hinson teaches (lines 50-57 column 7) that the invention
can be implemented in combination with other program modules that implement
particular abstract data types. Therefore one of ordinary skill in the art would conclude
that the particular abstract data type could be metadata defining the structure of data
objects and the object facility repository of Hinson could be a meta object facility
repository.

Hinson further does not teach vetoable event notification. LeBlanc teaches (Fig.
4, line 39 column 7 to line 12 column 9) a system of event notification having an event
producer and multiple event listeners wherein before an event is occurred; a vetoable
condition is being tested. If the vetoable condition is satisfied, the event is not going to
occur. If the vetoable condition is not satisfied, the event occurred. It would have been
obvious to apply the teachings of LeBlanc to the system of Hinson because by using
vetoable condition, the system could make appropriate changes as disclosed by
LeBlanc (line 59 column 8 to line 12 column 9).

As to claims 16-19, they are apparatus claims of claims 1, 4, 8, and 3,
respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 4, 8, and 3
above.

As to claim 24, it is an apparatus claim of claim 13. Therefore, it is rejected for
the same reasons as claim 13 above.

As to claims 26-31 and 33-38, they are apparatus claims of claims 1-6 and 8-13, respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1-6 and 8-13 above.

As to claims 40-42, they are computer program product claims of claims 1 and 12-13, respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 12-13 above.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 10/3/2005 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) rejection.

Applicant's arguments presented issues which required the Examiner to further view the previous rejection. The Examiner conducted a further search regarding the issues mentioned in Applicant's response. Therefore, all arguments regarding the cited references of the previous rejection are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andy Ho whose telephone number is (571) 272-3762. A voice mail service is also available for this number. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday, 8:30 am – 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571) 272-3718.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIM) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or' Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or fax to:

- AFTER-FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to (571) 273 - 8300.

- OFFICAL faxes must be signed and sent to (571) 273 - 8300.

- NON OFFICAL faxes should not be signed, please send to (571) 273 – 3762

A.H
December 23, 2005

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER